

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-18 and 25-30 are pending in the application. Claims 1-18 and 25-30 are rejected. Claims 19-24 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1-18, and 25-30 remain.

Reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

It is asserted by the Examiner that Applicant's arguments filed 03/11/2009 have been fully considered but are not persuasive, the Examiner noting Monte discloses an EPG module located inside a PVR, which comprises user-operable editing means for altering the user profile, and also the selection means may comprises a generated EPG, allowing a user to select broadcast programs manually. The Examiner contends that such usage history is arguably provided by Masters modified with the EPG generating method as taught by Montie. The Examiner further contends that the open-ended claim language does not preclude that the generated EPG comprises only programming for the personal channel.

In response, Applicant notes that the personal channel is a personalized channel for the user. The preferred program is preferred by the user and is determined based on usage history of the PDR. The preferred program is listed in the EPG and is provided through the personal channel.

Therefore, the personal channel is a channel different from conventional channels provided by conventional broadcasting service providers. That is, the personal channel is an adapted channel for the user based on preference of the user in accordance with the usage history. Applicant has amended independent Claims 1, 10 and 25 to provide "wherein the personal channel is for providing the preferred program listed in the EPG to the user" to affirmatively recite this distinction.

Furthermore, Masters merely discloses a history of what the viewer has watched and recorded on the same day. Montie merely discloses EPG generation. However, Masters and Montie do not disclose that the personal channel is for providing a user preferred program, which is determined based on the usage history, listed in the EPG to the user. Further, although Masters and Montie each disclose the technical features of history and EPG generation, respectively, the technical feature of the present invention as set forth in the independent claims, as amended, namely "wherein the personal channel is for providing the preferred program listed in the EPG to the user" is not taught or suggested by combining Masters and Montie since neither reference is at all concerned with a personal channel for providing a preferred program listed on an 'EPG' for the user as disclosed and claimed by Applicant.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the claims pending following entry of this amendment, namely Claims 1-18 and 25-30, are now in condition for allowance, which early action is requested.

If there are any additional fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge those fees to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666. If a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of this Application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (310) 207-3800.

Respectfully submitted,  
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date:

5/11/09

By:

Eric S. Hyman, Reg. No. 30,139

1279 Oakmead Parkway  
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040  
Telephone (408) 720-8300  
Facsimile (408) 720-8383

**CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being submitted electronically via EFS Web to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

Linda Metz

5/11/09